

THE CALABI-YAU EQUATION ON THE KODAIRA-THURSTON MANIFOLD, VIEWED AS A S^1 -BUNDLE OVER A 3-TORUS

E. BUZANO, A. FINO AND L. VEZZONI

ABSTRACT. We prove that the Calabi-Yau equation on the Kodaira-Thurston manifold has a unique solution for every S^1 -invariant initial datum.

1. INTRODUCTION

The celebrated Calabi-Yau theorem affirms that given a compact Kähler manifold (M, Ω, J) with first Chern class $c_1(M)$, every $(1, 1)$ -form $\tilde{\rho} \in 2\pi c_1(M)$ is the *Ricci form* of a unique Kähler metric whose Kähler form belongs to the cohomology class $[\Omega]$. This theorem was conjectured by Calabi in [4] and subsequently proved by Yau in [15]. The Calabi-Yau theorem can be alternatively reformulated in terms of symplectic geometry by saying that, given a compact Kähler manifold (M^n, Ω, J) and a volume form σ satisfying the normalizing condition

$$\int_M \sigma = \int_M \Omega^n,$$

then there exists a unique Kähler form $\tilde{\Omega}$ on (M, J) solving

$$(1) \quad \tilde{\Omega}^n = \sigma, \quad [\tilde{\Omega}] = [\Omega].$$

Equation (1) still makes sense in the *almost-Kähler* case, when J is merely an almost-complex structure. In this more general context (1) is usually called the *Calabi-Yau equation*.

In [5] Donaldson described a project about compact symplectic 4-manifolds involving the Calabi-Yau equation and showed the uniqueness of the solutions. Donaldson's project is principally based on a conjecture stated in [5] whose confirmation would lead to new fundamental results in symplectic geometry. Donaldson's project was partially confirmed by Taubes in [9] and strongly motivates the study of the Calabi-Yau equation on non-Kähler 4-manifolds.

In [16] Weinkove proved that the Calabi-Yau equation can be solved if the torsion of J is sufficiently small and in [13] Tosatti, Weinkove and Yau proved the Donaldson conjecture assuming an extra condition on the curvature and the torsion of the almost-Kähler metric. Furthermore, Tosatti and Weinkove studied in [12] the Calabi-Yau equation on the Kodaira-Thurston manifold assuming the initial datum σ invariant under the action of a 2-dimensional torus T^2 . The Kodaira-Thurston is historically the first example of symplectic manifold without Kähler structures (see [11, 1]) and it is defined as the direct product of a compact quotient of the 3-dimensional Heisenberg group by a lattice with the circle S^1 . In [6] it is proved that when σ is T^2 -invariant, the Calabi-Yau equation on the Kodaira-Thurston manifold can be reduced to a Monge-Ampère equation on a torus which has always

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 32Q25, 32Q60, 35J60.

This work was supported by the project FIRB “Geometria Differenziale e teoria geometrica delle funzioni”, the project PRIN “Varietà reali e complesse: geometria, topologia e analisi armonica” and by G.N.S.A.G.A. of I.N.d.A.M.

solution. Moreover in [6, 3] the same equation is studied in every T^2 -fibration over a 2-torus.

The *Kodaira-Thurston manifold* is defined as the compact 4-manifold $M = \text{Nil}^3/\Gamma \times S^1$, where Nil^3 is the 3-dimensional real Heisenberg group

$$\text{Nil}^3 = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} 1 & x & z \\ 0 & 1 & y \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} : x, y, z \in \mathbb{R} \right\}$$

and Γ is the lattice in Nil^3 of matrices having integers entries.

Therefore M is parallelizable and has the global left-invariant co-frame

$$e^1 = dy, \quad e^2 = dx, \quad e^3 = dt, \quad e^4 = dz - xdy$$

inducing the standard metric $g = \sum (e^k \otimes e^k)$ and the triple of non-degenerate 2-forms

$$\Omega_1 = e^1 \wedge e^2 + e^3 \wedge e^4, \quad \Omega_2 = e^1 \wedge e^3 + e^4 \wedge e^2, \quad \Omega_3 = e^1 \wedge e^4 + e^2 \wedge e^3.$$

Every pair (Ω_k, g) specifies an almost complex structure J_k making (g, J_k) an almost Hermitian structure. It turn out that J_1 is integrable, whereas (Ω_2, J_2) , (Ω_3, J_3) are almost-Kähler, since Ω_2 and Ω_3 are both symplectic. This fact actually implies that $\Omega_2 + i\Omega_3$ is a *holomorphic-symplectic* structure on (M, J_1) .

Moreover, M can be viewed as the total space of an S^1 -bundle over the 3-dimensional torus $T^3 = T_{xy}^2 \times S_t^1$ therefore it is rather natural to extend the analysis in [12, 6] when σ is S^1 -invariant instead of T^2 -invariant. We show that the Calabi-Yau equation on the Kodaira-Thurston manifold has a unique solution assuming the initial datum σ invariant under the action of the fiber S^1 . The result holds for the canonical almost-Kähler structures defined by the symplectic forms Ω_2 and Ω_3 and more in general for a family of almost-Kähler structures (Ω, J) such that e^4 is orthogonal to e^1, e^2, e^3 with respect to the Riemannian metric induced by (Ω, J) .

Acknowledgements. The authors would like to thank Valentino Tosatti for useful remarks and helpful comments on the preliminary version of the present paper.

2. THE MAIN RESULTS

Since $\text{Nil}^3/\Gamma \times S^1 = (\text{Nil}^3 \times \mathbb{R})/(\Gamma \times \mathbb{Z})$, the Kodaira-Thurston manifold M is a 2-step nilmanifold and every left-invariant almost-Kähler structure on $\text{Nil}^3 \times \mathbb{R}$ projects to an almost-Kähler structure on M . Moreover, the compact 3-dimensional manifold $N = \text{Nil}^3/\Gamma$ is the total space of an S^1 -bundle over a 2-dimensional torus T^2 with projection $\pi_{xy}: N \rightarrow T_{xy}^2$ and M inherits a structure of principal S^1 -bundle over the 3-dimensional torus $T^3 = T_{xy}^2 \times S_t^1$, i.e.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} S^1 & \longrightarrow & N \times S^1 = M \\ & & \downarrow \\ & & T^2 \times S^1 = T^3. \end{array}$$

Furthermore M is parallelizable and has the global left-invariant co-frame

$$e^1 = dy, \quad e^2 = dx, \quad e^3 = dt, \quad e^4 = dz - xdy,$$

satisfying the structure equations

$$(2) \quad de^1 = de^2 = de^3 = 0, \quad de^4 = e^{12},$$

where $e^{ij} = e^i \wedge e^j$.

Notice that a differential form γ on M is invariant by the action of the fiber S_z^1 if and only if its coefficients with respect to the global basis $e^{j_1, \dots, j_k} = e^{j_1} \wedge \dots \wedge e^{j_k}$ do not depend on the variable z .

In this paper we mainly focus on the almost-Kähler structure (Ω_2, J_2) which we denote by (Ω, J) in order to simplify the notation. The Calabi-Yau equation on (M, Ω, J) can be written as

$$(3) \quad (\Omega + d\alpha)^2 = e^F \Omega^2,$$

where the unknown α is a smooth 1-form on M such that

$$(4) \quad J(d\alpha) = d\alpha,$$

and the datum F is a smooth function on M such that

$$(5) \quad \int_M e^F \Omega^2 = \int_M \Omega^2.$$

Our main result is the following

Theorem 1. *For every smooth S^1 -invariant volume form $e^F \Omega^2$ satisfying condition (5), equation (3) has a unique solution satisfying (4).*

Since uniqueness follows from a general result in [5], then we need only to prove existence. This will be done in two steps. Firstly in Section 3 we reduce equation (3) to a fully nonlinear PDE on the 3-dimensional base torus T^3 . Then in Section 5 we show that such an equation is solvable. Section 4 concerns the a-priori estimates needed in Section 5.

With some minor changes in the proof, it is possible to generalize Theorem 1 to a large class of invariant almost-Kähler structures on the Kodaira-Thurston manifold

Theorem 2. *Let (Ω, J) be an invariant almost-Kähler structure on M with induced metric g . Assume that e^4 is orthogonal to e^1, e^2, e^3 with respect to g and that*

$$(6) \quad J e^4 \in \text{span}_{\mathbb{Q}}\{e^1, e^2, e^3\}.$$

Then the Calabi-Yau equation (3) has a unique solution satisfying (4) for every S^1 -invariant volume form $e^F \Omega^2$ satisfying (5).

It is clear that the almost-Kähler structure (Ω_2, J_2) occurs as a case considered in Theorem 2. Moreover Theorem 2 works for (Ω_3, J_3) and, more generally, for the family of almost-Kähler structures

$$\omega_\theta = \cos \theta \Omega_2 + \sin \theta \Omega_3, \quad g = \sum_{i=1}^4 e^i \otimes e^i$$

when $\tan \theta \in \mathbb{Q}$.

3. REDUCTION TO A SINGLE EQUATION

Denote by dV the volume form $dx \wedge dy \wedge dt$ on T^3 .

Proposition 3. *Let F a smooth function on T^3 satisfying the following condition*

$$(7) \quad \int_{T^3} e^F dV = 1$$

and let $u : T^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a smooth function such that

$$(8) \quad \int_{T^3} u dV = 0.$$

Consider the 1-form

$$(9) \quad \alpha = d^c u - u e^1.$$

Then $d\alpha$ satisfies (4). Moreover α solves (3) if and only if u solves the following PDE

$$(10) \quad (u_{xx} + 1)(u_{yy} + u_{tt} + u_t + 1) - u_{xy}^2 - u_{xt}^2 = e^F.$$

Proof. Let

$$e_1 = \partial_y + x\partial_z, \quad e_2 = \partial_x, \quad e_3 = \partial_t, \quad e_4 = \partial_z$$

be the dual frame to $\{e^1, e^2, e^3, e^4\}$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} dd^c u &= -dJdu = - \sum_{i,k=1}^3 u_{ik} e^i \wedge J e^k - u_2 de^4 \\ &= - \sum_{i,k=1}^3 u_{ik} e^i \wedge J e^k - u_2 e^{12}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$(11) \quad u_1 = e_1 u = u_y, \quad u_2 = e_2 u = u_x, \quad u_3 = e_3 u = u_t.$$

Observe that $e_4 u = 0$, since u does not depend on z .

We have

$$d(ue^1) = -u_2 e^{12} - u_3 e^{13}.$$

Therefore

$$dd^c u = - \sum_{i,k=1}^3 u_{ik} e^i \wedge J e^k + d(ue^1) + u_3 e^{13}.$$

It follows that $d\alpha$ is of type $(1, 1)$ and that

$$(\Omega + d\alpha)^2 = \left((1 + u_{22})(1 + u_{11} + u_{33} + u_3) - (u_{23})^2 - (u_{12})^2 \right) \Omega^2,$$

and equation (3) becomes

$$(12) \quad (u_{22} + 1)(u_{11} + u_{33} + u_3 + 1) - (u_{23})^2 - (u_{12})^2 = e^F.$$

Thanks to (11), equations (12) and (10) coincide. $\square$

4. A PRIORI ESTIMATES

We begin by fixing some notation. Functions on the 3-torus can be identified with functions $u : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ which are 1-periodic in each variable.

For any non-negative integer n , we denote by $C^n(T^3)$ the Banach space of C^n functions $u : T^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ equipped with norm

$$\|u\|_{C^n} = \max_{m \leq n} |u|_{C^m},$$

where

$$|u|_{C^m} = \max_{i+j+k=m} \sup_{T^3} |\partial_x^i \partial_y^j \partial_t^k u(x, y, t)|.$$

Given $0 < \rho < 1$ and $u \in C^0(T^3)$, we set

$$\left[u(x, y, t) \right]_\rho = \sup_{0 < |h| \leq 1} |u(x + h_1, y + h_2, t + h_3) - u(x, y, t)| |h|^{-\rho}.$$

For every non-negative integer n and real number $0 < \rho < 1$, define the space $C^{n+\rho}(T^3)$ of functions $u \in C^n(T^3)$ such that

$$|u|_{C^{n+\rho}} = \max_{i+j+k=n} \sup_{T^3} \left[\partial_x^i \partial_y^j \partial_t^k u(x, y, t) \right]_\rho < \infty.$$

$C^{n+\rho}(T^3)$ is a Banach space with respect to the norm

$$\|u\|_{C^{n+\rho}} = \max \left\{ \|u\|_{C^n}, |u|_{C^{n+\rho}} \right\}.$$

In conclusion we have defined $C^\sigma(T^3)$ for every non negative real number σ .

Finally, we denote by $\tilde{C}^\sigma(T^3)$ the closed subspace of all $u \in C^\sigma(T^3)$ satisfying

$$\int_{T^3} u dV = 0,$$

where dV denotes as usual the volume form $dx \wedge dy \wedge dt$ on T^3 .

4.1. C^0 -estimate.

Proposition 4. *Let $u \in C^2(T^3)$ be a solution to (10). Then we have*

$$(13) \quad u_{xx} > -1$$

and

$$(14) \quad u_{yy} + u_{tt} + u_t > -1.$$

Proof. Indeed, from equation (10), we have

$$(u_{yy} + u_{tt} + u_t + 1)(u_{xx} + 1) \geq e^F > 0.$$

This implies that $u_{yy} + u_{tt} + u_t + 1$ and $u_{xx} + 1$ have always the same sign. But at a point where u attains its minimum, the second derivatives are non-negative. In particular $u_{xx} + 1$ must be positive. $\square$

Proposition 5. *Let $u \in C^2(T^3)$ be a solution to (10). Then we have*

$$(15) \quad |u_x| \leq 1.$$

Proof. Fix $y, t \in [0, 1]$ and let x_0 be a point in $[0, 1]$ where $x \mapsto u(x, y, t)$ attains its minimum. In particular, we have $u_x(x_0, y, t) = 0$. Integrating (13) yields

$$u_x(x, y, t) \geq -(x - x_0) \geq -1, \quad \text{for } x_0 \leq x \leq x_0 + 1$$

and

$$-u_x(x, y, t) \geq -(x_0 - x) \geq -1, \quad \text{for } x_0 - 1 \leq x \leq x_0.$$

By periodicity, these estimates hold for all x . This proves estimate (15). $\square$

Theorem 6. *For all $u \in \tilde{C}^2(T^3)$ satisfying equation (10), and all $1 < p < \infty$, we have*

$$(16) \quad \|\nabla |u|^{p/2}\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \frac{p^2}{16} \|u\|_{L^p}^p + \frac{p^2}{16} \left(p + \frac{8}{p-1} \|1 - e^F\|_{C^0} \right) \|u\|_{L^p}^{p-1}.$$

Proof. Set

$$(17) \quad \alpha = -(u_t + u)e^1 + u_y e^3 - u_x e^4.$$

By Proposition 3, α solves (3). Then

$$(e^F - 1) \Omega^2 = d\alpha \wedge (\Omega + \tilde{\Omega}),$$

where

$$\tilde{\Omega} = \Omega + d\alpha.$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} d(u |u|^{p-2}) &= |u|^{p-2} du + u(p-2) |u|^{p-3} \frac{u}{|u|} du \\ &= (p-1) |u|^{p-2} du, \quad \text{for } u \neq 0, \end{aligned}$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} (18) \quad \int_{T^3} d\left((u |u|^{p-2} \alpha) \wedge (\Omega + \tilde{\Omega})\right) &= \\ &= (p-1) \int_{T^3} |u|^{p-2} du \wedge \alpha \wedge (\Omega + \tilde{\Omega}) + \int_{T^3} |u|^{p-2} u (e^F - 1) \Omega^2 \end{aligned}$$

and Stokes' theorem implies

$$(19) \quad \int_{T^3} |u|^{p-2} du \wedge \alpha \wedge (\Omega + \tilde{\Omega}) = \frac{1}{p-1} \int_{T^3} (1 - e^F) |u|^{p-2} u \Omega^2.$$

Taking into account that

$$\begin{aligned}
 du &= u_y e^1 + u_x e^2 + u_t e^3, \\
 d\alpha &= u_{xt}(e^{12} - e^{34}) + (u_{yy} + u_{tt} + u_t)e^{13} - u_{xy}(e^{14} - e^{23}) - u_{xx}e^{24}, \\
 (20) \quad \tilde{\Omega} &= u_{xt}(e^{12} - e^{34}) + (1 + u_{yy} + u_{tt} + u_t)e^{13} - u_{xy}(e^{14} - e^{23}) - (1 + u_{xx})e^{24},
 \end{aligned}$$

we have

$$(21) \quad du \wedge \alpha \wedge \Omega = \frac{1}{2} (u_x^2 + u_y^2 + u_t(u_t + u)) \Omega^2,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
 (22) \quad du \wedge \alpha \wedge \tilde{\Omega} &= \frac{1}{2} \left((u_y^2 + (u_t + u/2)^2)(1 + u_{xx}) + u_x^2(1 + u_{yy} + u_{tt} + u_t) \right) \Omega^2 \\
 &\quad - (u_x u_y u_{xy} + u_x(u_t + u/2)u_{xt}) \Omega^2 - \frac{1}{8} u^2(1 + u_{xx}) \Omega^2.
 \end{aligned}$$

But from (10) and (13) we deduce that the quadratic form

$$\mathcal{Q}(\theta) = (1 + u_{xx})(\theta_1^2 + \theta_3^2) + (1 + u_{yy} + u_{tt} + u_t)\theta_2^2 - 2u_{xy}\theta_1\theta_2 - 2u_{xt}\theta_2\theta_3$$

is positive-definite. Then from (19), (21) and (22) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 (23) \quad \int_{T^3} |u|^{p-2} (u_x^2 + u_y^2 + u_t(u_t + u)) dV &- \frac{1}{4} \int_{T^3} |u|^p (1 + u_{xx}) dV \leq \\
 &\leq \frac{2}{p-1} \int_{T^3} (1 - e^F) |u|^{p-2} u dV.
 \end{aligned}$$

An integration by parts gives

$$\int_{T^3} |u|^{p-2} u u_t dV = - \int_{T^3} \partial_t (|u|^{p-2} u) u dV = (1-p) \int_{T^3} |u|^{p-2} u u_t dV,$$

therefore we have

$$\int_{T^3} |u|^{p-2} u u_t dV = 0.$$

Since, moreover

$$\int_{T^3} |u|^p u_{xx} dV = -p \int_{T^3} |u|^{p-2} u u_x^2 dV,$$

estimates (15) and (23) imply

$$\begin{aligned}
 (24) \quad \int_{T^3} |u|^{p-2} |\nabla u|^2 dV &\leq \frac{1}{4} \int_{T^3} |u|^p dV + \left(\frac{p}{4} + \frac{2}{p-1} \|1 - e^F\|_{C^0} \right) \int_{T^3} |u|^{p-1} dV.
 \end{aligned}$$

But the left-hand side can be rewritten as

$$\int_{T^3} |u|^{p-2} |\nabla u|^2 dV = \frac{4}{p^2} \int_{T^3} |\nabla |u|^{p/2}|^2 dV.$$

Then (24) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
 (25) \quad \int_{T^3} |\nabla |u|^{p/2}|^2 dV &\leq \\
 &\leq \frac{p^2}{16} \int_{T^3} |u|^p dV + \frac{p^2}{4} \left(\frac{p}{4} + \frac{2}{p-1} \|1 - e^F\|_{C^0} \right) \int_{T^3} |u|^{p-1} dV.
 \end{aligned}$$

Since T^3 has measure 1, we have

$$(26) \quad \|u\|_{L^{p-1}} \leq \|u\|_{L^p}.$$

Estimate (16) follows from (25) and (26). $\square$

It is rather natural to compare estimate (16) with the classical a priori Yau's estimate

$$\|\nabla |\varphi|^{p/2}\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \frac{mp^2}{4p-1} (\|1 - e^F\|_{C^0}) \|\varphi\|_{L^p}^{p-1}$$

involving the solutions φ to the complex Monge-Ampère equation $(\omega + dd^c \varphi)^m = e^F \omega^m$ in $2m$ -dimensional Kähler manifolds (see for instance [8, Proposition 5.4.1]). The right-end side of (16) contains the extra term $\frac{p^2}{16} \|u\|_{L^p}^p$ due to the presence of $-ue^1$ in (9). This is a problem in the first step of C^0 -estimate, that is with $p = 2$. We take care of this in the next two propositions.

Proposition 7. *We have*

$$(27) \quad 2\pi \|u\|_{L^2} \leq \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}, \quad \text{for all } u \in \tilde{C}^1(T^3).$$

Proof. Consider the Fourier series expansion

$$\|u\|_{L^2}^2 = \sum_{(k,m,n) \in \mathbb{Z}^3 \setminus \{(0,0,0)\}} |\hat{u}_{k,m,n}|^2,$$

where

$$\hat{u}_{k,m,n} = \int_{T^3} e^{-2\pi i(kx+my+nt)} u(x,y,t) dV.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} |\widehat{\nabla u}_{k,m,n}|^2 &= 4\pi^2(k^2 + m^2 + n^2) |\hat{u}_{k,m,n}|^2 \geq \\ &\geq 4\pi^2 |\hat{u}_{k,m,n}|^2, \quad \text{for all } (k,m,n) \in \mathbb{Z}^3 \setminus \{(0,0,0)\}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 &= \sum_{(k,m,n) \in \mathbb{Z}^3 \setminus \{(0,0,0)\}} |\widehat{\nabla u}_{k,m,n}|^2 \geq 4\pi^2 \sum_{(k,m,n) \in \mathbb{Z}^3 \setminus \{(0,0,0)\}} |\hat{u}_{k,m,n}|^2 \\ &= 4\pi^2 \|u\|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\|\nabla |u|\|_{L^2}^2 = \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2,$$

we obtain (27). □

Proposition 8. *For all $u \in \tilde{C}^2(T^3)$ satisfying equation (10) we have*

$$(28) \quad \|\nabla u\|_{L^2} \leq \frac{16\pi}{16\pi^2 - 1} \|1 + e^F\|_{C^0}.$$

Proof. From (16) with $p = 2$ and (27) we obtain

$$\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \frac{1}{16\pi^2} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{4\pi} \left(1 + 4 \|1 - e^F\|_{C^0}\right) \|\nabla u\|_{L^2},$$

which readily implies the statement. □

Now we are ready to prove an a priori C^0 estimate for the solutions to (10):

Theorem 9. *There exists a positive constant C such that*

$$(29) \quad \|u\|_{C^0} \leq C \|1 + e^F\|_{C^0},$$

for all $u \in \tilde{C}^2(T^3)$ satisfying equation (10) and all $F \in C^0(T^3)$ satisfying condition (7).

Proof. From Sobolev Imbedding Theorem (see for instance [2, Theorem 5.4]), there exists a positive constant C' such that

$$(30) \quad \|w\|_{L^6}^2 \leq C' (\|w\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla w\|_{L^2}^2),$$

for all w in the Sobolev space $W^{1,2}(T^3)$.

Then from (16) and (30) we have

$$(31) \quad \|u\|_{L^{3p}}^p \leq C' \left(1 + \frac{p^2}{16}\right) \|u\|_{L^p}^p + C' \frac{p^2}{16} \left(p + \frac{8}{p-1} \|1 + e^F\|_{C^0}\right) \|u\|_{L^p}^{p-1},$$

for all $1 < p < \infty$. If

$$p \geq 2 \quad \text{and} \quad u \neq 0,$$

(31) implies

$$\left(\frac{\|u\|_{L^{3p}}}{\|u\|_{L^p}}\right)^p \leq \frac{C'}{2} p^3 \left(1 + \|1 + e^F\|_{C^0} \|u\|_{L^2}^{-1}\right).$$

It follows that

$$\frac{\|u\|_{L^{3p_k}}}{\|u\|_{L^{p_k}}} \leq (Mp_k^3)^{1/p_k}, \quad \text{for all } k \in \mathbb{Z}_+,$$

with

$$(32) \quad M = \frac{C'}{2} \left(1 + \|1 + e^F\|_{C^0} \|u\|_{L^2}^{-1}\right)$$

and

$$p_k = 2 \cdot 3^k.$$

Then

$$\frac{\|u\|_{L^{3p_n}}}{\|u\|_{L^2}} \leq \prod_{k=0}^n (Mp_k^3)^{1/p_k}, \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{Z}_+.$$

But

$$\prod_{k=0}^{\infty} (Mp_k^3)^{1/p_k} = \exp\left(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2 \cdot 3^k} (\log(8M) + 3k \log 3)\right) = (8M)^{3/4} 3^{3\mu/2},$$

with

$$\mu = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{k}{3^k} < \infty.$$

Then

$$(33) \quad \|u\|_{C^0} = \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \|u\|_{L^{p_n}} \leq (8M)^{3/4} 3^{3\mu/2} \|u\|_{L^2}.$$

Now from (32), (27) and (28) we have

$$\begin{aligned} M^{3/4} \|u\|_{L^2} &= \left(\frac{C'}{2}\right)^{3/4} \left(\|u\|_{L^2} + \|1 + e^F\|_{C^0}\right)^{3/4} \|u\|_{L^2}^{1/4} \\ &\leq \left(\frac{C'}{2}\right)^{3/4} \frac{16\pi^2 - 7}{16\pi^2 - 1} \|1 + e^F\|_{C^0}, \end{aligned}$$

and (29) follows from (33). $\square$

4.2. C^0 -estimate of Δu . Let

$$\Delta = \partial_x^2 + \partial_y^2 + \partial_t^2,$$

be the Laplacian on $\mathbb{R}^3$.

Proposition 10. *Let $u \in \tilde{C}^2(T^3)$ be a solution to equation (10). Then we have*

$$(34) \quad 0 < 2e^{F/2} \leq 2 + \Delta u + u_t,$$

and

$$(35) \quad 0 < \lambda_- I \leq H \leq \lambda_+ I$$

where I is the identity matrix,

$$H = \begin{bmatrix} 1 + u_{yy} + u_{tt} + u_t & u_{xy} & u_{xt} \\ u_{xy} & 1 + u_{xx} & 0 \\ u_{xt} & 0 & 1 + u_{xx} \end{bmatrix}$$

and

$$(36) \quad \lambda_{\pm} = \frac{1}{2} \left(2 + \Delta u + u_t \pm \sqrt{(2 + \Delta u + u_t)^2 - 4e^F} \right).$$

Proof. Inequality (34) follows from (13), (14) and (10).

A simple computation shows that the characteristic polynomial of H is

$$(\lambda - (1 + u_{xx}))(\lambda^2 - (2 + \Delta u + u_t)\lambda + e^F).$$

Then the eigenvalues of H are $\lambda_{\pm}$ and $1 + u_{xx}$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} (2 + \Delta u + u_t)^2 - 4e^F &= ((1 + u_{yy} + u_{tt} + u_t) - (1 + u_{xx}))^2 + u_{xy}^2 + u_{xt}^2 \\ &\geq ((2 + \Delta u + u_t) - 2(1 + u_{xx}))^2, \end{aligned}$$

we have

$$\lambda_- \leq 1 + u_{xx} \leq \lambda_+$$

and the proof is complete. $\square$

Theorem 11. *Given $F \in C^2(T^3)$ satisfying condition (7), there exists a positive constant C , depending only on $\|F\|_{C^2}$, such that*

$$(37) \quad |\Delta u|_{C^0} \leq C(1 + |u|_{C^1}),$$

for all $u \in \tilde{C}^4(T^3)$ solution to equation (10).

Proof. From equation (10) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (38) \quad (\Delta F + |\nabla F|^2 + F_t)e^F &= \\ &= (1 + u_{yy} + u_{tt} + u_t)(\Delta u_{xx} + u_{xxt}) + (1 + u_{xx})(\Delta u_{yy} + u_{yyt} + \Delta u_{tt} + u_{ttt}) + \\ &\quad + (1 + u_{xx})(\Delta u_t + u_{tt}) + 2\nabla u_{xx} \cdot \nabla(u_{yy} + u_{tt} + u_t) - \\ &\quad - 2u_{xy}(\Delta u_{xy} + u_{xyt}) - 2|\nabla u_{xy}|^2 - 2u_{xt}(\Delta u_{xt} + u_{xtt}) - 2|\nabla u_{xt}|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Consider

$$(39) \quad G = (2 + \Delta u + u_t)e^{-\mu u},$$

where

$$(40) \quad \mu = \frac{\epsilon}{\max(2 + \Delta u + u_t)}$$

and ϵ is a positive constant to be chosen later. Differentiating (39) yields

$$\nabla G = e^{-\mu u} \left(\nabla(\Delta u + u_t) - \mu(2 + \Delta u + u_t)\nabla u \right),$$

and¹

$$\begin{aligned} (\nabla \otimes \nabla)G &= -\mu e^{-\mu u} \left(\nabla u \otimes \nabla(\Delta u + u_t) + \nabla(\Delta u + u_t) \otimes \nabla u \right) \\ &\quad + \mu^2 e^{-\mu u} \left((2 + \Delta u + u_t) \nabla u \otimes \nabla u \right) + \\ &\quad + e^{-\mu u} \left((\nabla \otimes \nabla)(\Delta u + u_t) - \mu(2 + \Delta u + u_t)(\nabla \otimes \nabla)u \right). \end{aligned}$$

At a point where G attains its maximum value we have $\nabla G = 0$ and $(\nabla \otimes \nabla)G \leq 0$, that is

$$(41) \quad \nabla(\Delta u + u_t) = \mu(2 + \Delta u + u_t)\nabla u,$$

and

$$(\nabla \otimes \nabla)(\Delta u + u_t) \leq \mu(2 + \Delta u + u_t) \left((\nabla \otimes \nabla)u + \mu \nabla u \otimes \nabla u \right).$$

In particular, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(\mu(2 + \Delta u + u_t)(u_{xy} + \mu u_x u_y) - (\Delta u_{xy} + u_{xyt}) \right)^2 \leq \\ &\leq \left(\mu(2 + \Delta u + u_t)(u_{xx} + \mu u_x^2) - (\Delta u_{xx} + u_{xxt}) \right) \cdot \\ &\quad \cdot \left(\mu(2 + \Delta u + u_t)(u_{yy} + \mu u_y^2) - (\Delta u_{yy} + u_{yyt}) \right), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(\mu(2 + \Delta u + u_t)(u_{xt} + \mu u_x u_t) - (\Delta u_{xt} + u_{xtt}) \right)^2 \leq \\ &\leq \left(\mu(2 + \Delta u + u_t)(u_{xx} + \mu u_x^2) - (\Delta u_{xx} + u_{xxt}) \right) \cdot \\ &\quad \cdot \left(\mu(2 + \Delta u + u_t)(u_{tt} + \mu u_t^2) - (\Delta u_{tt} + u_{ttt}) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Then (35) implies

$$\begin{aligned} (42) \quad &(1 + u_{yy} + u_{tt} + u_t)(\Delta u_{xx} + u_{xxt}) + \\ &+ (1 + u_{xx})(\Delta u_{yy} + u_{yyt} + \Delta u_{tt} + u_{ttt}) - \\ &- 2u_{xy}(\Delta u_{xy} + u_{xyt}) - 2u_{xt}(\Delta u_{xt} + u_{xtt}) \leq \\ &\leq \mu(2 + \Delta u + u_t)(1 + u_{yy} + u_{tt} + u_t)(u_{xx} + \mu u_x^2) + \\ &+ \mu(2 + \Delta u + u_t)(1 + u_{xx})(u_{yy} + \mu u_y^2 + u_{tt} + \mu u_t^2) - \\ &- 2\mu(2 + \Delta u + u_t) \left(u_{xy}(u_{xy} + \mu u_x u_y) + u_{xt}(u_{xt} + \mu u_x u_t) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Substituting (41) and (42) into (38), and using (34), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (43) \quad &(\Delta F + |\nabla F|^2 + F_t)e^F \leq \\ &\leq \mu(2 + \Delta u + u_t)(1 + u_{yy} + u_{tt} + u_t)(u_{xx} + \mu u_x^2) + \\ &+ \mu(2 + \Delta u + u_t)(1 + u_{xx})(u_{yy} + \mu u_y^2 + u_{tt} + \mu u_t^2) + \\ &+ \mu(2 + \Delta u + u_t)(1 + u_{xx})u_t + 2\nabla u_{xx} \cdot \nabla(u_{yy} + u_{tt} + u_t) + \\ &- 2\mu(2 + \Delta u + u_t) \left(u_{xy}(u_{xy} + \mu u_x u_y) + u_{xt}(u_{xt} + \mu u_x u_t) \right). \end{aligned}$$

¹ Here we make use of the tensor product notation:

$$A \otimes B = \begin{bmatrix} a_1 b_1 & a_1 b_2 & a_1 b_3 \\ a_2 b_1 & a_2 b_2 & a_2 b_3 \\ a_3 b_1 & a_3 b_2 & a_3 b_3 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{with } A = \begin{bmatrix} a_1 \\ a_2 \\ a_3 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and } B = \begin{bmatrix} b_1 \\ b_2 \\ b_3 \end{bmatrix}.$$

In particular $(\nabla \otimes \nabla)u$ is the Hessian matrix of u , and $(\text{tr}(\nabla \otimes \nabla))u = \Delta u$.

On the other side, from (41) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 (44) \quad \mu^2(2 + \Delta u + u_t)^2 |\nabla u|^2 &= |\nabla(\Delta u + u_t)|^2 = \\
 &= |\nabla u_{xx}|^2 + |\nabla(u_{yy} + u_{tt} + u_t)|^2 + 2\nabla u_{xx} \cdot \nabla(u_{yy} + u_{tt} + u_t) \\
 &\geq 2\nabla u_{xx} \cdot \nabla(u_{yy} + u_{tt} + u_t).
 \end{aligned}$$

Eventually from (43), and (44) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 (45) \quad (\Delta F + |\nabla F|^2 + F_t)e^F &\leq \\
 &\leq \mu(2 + \Delta u + u_t) \left((1 + u_{yy} + u_{tt} + u_t)u_{xx} + (1 + u_{xx})(u_{yy} + u_{tt} + u_t) \right) \\
 &\quad - 2\mu(2 + \Delta u + u_t)(u_{xy}^2 + u_{xt}^2) \\
 &\quad + 2\mu^2(2 + \Delta u + u_t) \left((1 + u_{yy} + u_{tt} + u_t)u_x^2 + (1 + u_{xx})(u_y^2 + u_t^2) \right) \\
 &\quad + \mu^2(2 + \Delta u + u_t)^2 |\nabla u|^2 \\
 &\leq 2\mu(2 + \Delta u + u_t)e^F - \mu(2 + \Delta u + u_t)^2 + 3\mu^2(2 + \Delta u + u_t)^2 |\nabla u|^2.
 \end{aligned}$$

at any point where G attains its maximum value. Let (x_0, y_0, t_0) be a point where G attains its maximum value. Set

$$M = 2 + \Delta u(x_0, y_0, t_0) + u_t(x_0, y_0, t_0)$$

and

$$u_0 = u(x_0, y_0, t_0),$$

so that

$$\max G = Me^{-\mu u_0}.$$

From (45) we get

$$(46) \quad \mu M^2 \leq |(\Delta F + F_t)e^F|_{C^0} + 2\mu M \|e^F\|_{C^0} + 3\mu^2 M^2 |u|_{C^1}^2.$$

Denote by $\tilde{u}$ the value of u at a point where $2 + \Delta u + u_t$ attains its maximum. Then we have

$$(47) \quad M \leq \max(2 + \Delta u + u_t) \leq Me^{\mu(\tilde{u} - u_0)} \leq Me^{2\mu|u|_{C^0}}.$$

Moreover, (40) and (34) imply

$$2\mu = \frac{2\epsilon}{\max(2 + \Delta u + u_t)} \leq \epsilon e^{-\min F/2} \leq e^{-\min F/2},$$

then, (47) yields

$$(48) \quad \epsilon \exp\left(-e^{-\min F/2} |u|_{C^0}\right) \leq \mu M \leq \epsilon$$

and

$$(49) \quad \exp\left(-e^{-\min F/2} |u|_{C^0}\right) \max(2 + \Delta u + u_t) \leq M.$$

Eventually from (46), (48), and (49) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 \epsilon \exp\left(-2e^{-\min F/2} |u|_{C^0}\right) \max(2 + \Delta u + u_t) &\leq \\
 &\leq |(\Delta F + F_t)e^F|_{C^0} + 2\epsilon \|e^F\|_{C^0} + 3\epsilon^2 |u|_{C^1}^2,
 \end{aligned}$$

that is

$$\begin{aligned}
 (50) \quad \max(2 + \Delta u + u_t) &\leq \\
 &\leq \exp\left(2e^{-\min F/2} |u|_{C^0}\right) \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} |(\Delta F + F_t)e^F|_{C^0} + 2\|e^F\|_{C^0} + 3\epsilon |u|_{C^1}^2\right).
 \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$|\Delta u|_{C^0} \leq \max(2 + \Delta u + u_t) + 2 + |u_t|_{C^0},$$

estimate (37) follows from (27), (28) and (50), with

$$\epsilon = \frac{1}{1 + |u|_{C^1}}.$$

□

Now we prove a simple interpolation inequality.

Theorem 12. *For all $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a positive constant M_ϵ such that*

$$|u|_{C^1} \leq M_\epsilon |u|_{C^0} + \epsilon |\Delta u|_{C^0}, \quad \text{for all } u \in C^2(T^3).$$

In order to prove the last theorem we need the following elementary lemma.

Lemma 13. *For all $R > 0$ and all $0 < \mu \leq 1/4$ we have*

$$M_{\mu,R} = \sup_{|h| \leq 1/2} |h|^{-\mu} \int_{|z| \leq R} \left| \frac{z-h}{|z-h|^3} - \frac{z}{|z|^3} \right| dz < \infty,$$

where $z, h \in \mathbb{R}^3$.

Proof. Consider the following cases:

- (1) $|z| > |h|^\mu$,
- (2) $|z-h| > |h|^\mu$,
- (3) $|z| \leq |h|^\mu$ and $|z-h| \leq |h|^\mu$.

We have the elementary estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{z-h}{|z-h|^3} - \frac{z}{|z|^3} \right| &= \left| \int_0^1 \frac{d}{ds} \frac{z-sh}{|z-sh|^3} ds \right| = \\ &= \left| \int_0^1 \left(\frac{-1}{|z-sh|^3} h + \frac{3(z-sh) \cdot h}{|z-sh|^5} (z-sh) \right) ds \right| \\ &\leq 4|h| \int_0^1 \frac{ds}{|z-sh|^3}. \end{aligned}$$

Then in case (1) we have

$$\left| \frac{z-h}{|z-h|^3} - \frac{z}{|z|^3} \right| \leq \frac{4|h|}{(|h|^\mu - |h|)^3} = \frac{4|h|^{1-3\mu}}{(1 - |h|^{1-\mu})^3} \leq \frac{4|h|^\mu}{(1 - 2^{(\mu-1)/\mu})^3},$$

while in case (2) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{z-h}{|z-h|^3} - \frac{z}{|z|^3} \right| &\leq 4|h| \int_0^1 \frac{ds}{|z-h+(1-s)h|^3} \leq \frac{4|h|}{(|h|^\mu - |h|)^3} \\ &\leq \frac{4|h|^\mu}{(1 - 2^{(\mu-1)/\mu})^3}. \end{aligned}$$

It remains to consider case (3). But then we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |h|^{-\mu} \int_{|z| \leq R} \left| \frac{z-h}{|z-h|^3} - \frac{z}{|z|^3} \right| dz &\leq |h|^{-\mu} \int_{|z| \leq R} \frac{dz}{|z-h|^2} + |h|^{-\mu} \int_{|z| \leq R} \frac{dz}{|z|^2} \\ &\leq \int_{|z| \leq R} \frac{dz}{|z-h|^{2+\mu}} + \int_{|z| \leq R} \frac{dz}{|z|^{2+\mu}} \leq 2 \int_{|z| \leq R+1} \frac{dz}{|z|^{2+\mu}} < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Theorem 12. Green's Representation Formula (see e.g. [7, formula (2.16)]) implies

$$(51) \quad u(p) = \int_{|q|=R} \left(\frac{u(q)}{4\pi |q-p|^2} + \frac{\nabla u(q) \cdot q}{4\pi R |q-p|} \right) d\sigma(q) - \int_{|q|\leq R} \frac{\Delta u(q)}{4\pi |q-p|} dq, \\ \text{for } |p| < R,$$

where

$$d\sigma(q) = R^2 \sin \theta \, d\phi \wedge d\theta$$

and

$$\begin{cases} q_1 = R \sin \phi \cos \theta, \\ q_2 = R \cos \phi \cos \theta, \\ q_3 = R \sin \theta, \end{cases}$$

are coordinates on the sphere with radius R and centered at the origin. Set

$$(52) \quad f(p) = \int_{|q|=R} \left(\frac{u(q)}{4\pi |q-p|^2} + \frac{\nabla u(q) \cdot q}{4\pi R |q-p|} \right) d\sigma(q),$$

and

$$(53) \quad g(p) = \int_{|q|\leq R} \frac{\Delta u(q)}{4\pi |q-p|} dq.$$

Now²

$$\begin{aligned} (\nabla \otimes \nabla) f(p) &= \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{|q|=R} 6 \frac{u(q)}{|q-p|^5} (q-p) \otimes (q-p) d\sigma(q) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{|q|=R} 2 \frac{u(q)}{|q-p|^3} d\sigma(q) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{|q|=R} 2 \frac{\nabla u(q) \cdot q}{R |q-p|^4} (q-p) \otimes (q-p) d\sigma(q) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{|q|=R} \frac{\nabla u(q) \cdot q}{R |q-p|^2} d\sigma(q), \end{aligned}$$

then, for all $0 < r < R$ we have

$$\sup_{|p|\leq r} |(\nabla \otimes \nabla) f(p)| \leq 8R^2 \frac{|u|_{C^0}}{(R-r)^3} + 9R^2 \frac{|u|_{C^1}}{(R-r)^2}.$$

This estimate shows that f belongs to $C^{1+\mu}(B_r)$, where B_r is the ball centered at the origin and with radius r , and satisfies the estimate:

$$(54) \quad |f|_{C^{1+\mu}(B_r)} \leq \frac{9R^2}{(R-r)^3} \left(|u|_{C^0} + (R-r) |u|_{C^1} \right) |h|^{1-\mu}.$$

On the other hand we have

$$\nabla g(p) = \nabla \int_{|q|\leq R} \frac{\Delta u(q)}{4\pi |q-p|} dq = \int_{|q|\leq R} \frac{\Delta u(q)}{4\pi |q-p|^3} (q-p) dq.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla g(p+h) - \nabla g(p)| &\leq \frac{|\Delta u|_{C_p^0}}{4\pi} \int_{|q|\leq R} \left| \frac{q-p-h}{|q-p-h|^3} - \frac{q-p}{|q-p|^3} \right| dq \\ &\leq \frac{|\Delta u|_{C_p^0}}{4\pi} \int_{|q|\leq R+r} \left| \frac{q-h}{|q-h|^3} - \frac{q}{|q|^3} \right| dq, \quad \text{for all } p \in \bar{B}_r, \end{aligned}$$

² Observe that $|\nabla u(q) \cdot q| \leq 3R |u|_{C_p^1}$.

and from Lemma 13 we obtain

$$(55) \quad |h|^{-\mu} |\nabla g(p+h) - \nabla g(p)| \leq (4\pi)^{-1} M_{\mu,2R} |\Delta u|_{C^0}, \quad \text{for } |p| \leq r \text{ and } |h| \leq 1/2.$$

Consider now $0 < r < R$ such that $Q \subset B_r$. Then from (51), (52), (53), (54), and (55) we obtain that there exists a positive constant M such that

$$(56) \quad |u|_{C^{1+\mu}} \leq M \left(|u|_{C^0} + |u|_{C^1} + |\Delta u|_{C^0} \right), \quad \text{for all } u \in C^2(T^3).$$

Thanks to standard interpolation inequality theory (see [7, section 6.8]), for all $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a positive constant M'_ϵ such that

$$(57) \quad |u|_{C^1} \leq M'_\epsilon |u|_{C^0} + \epsilon |u|_{C^{1+\mu}}, \quad \text{for all } u \in C^{1+\mu}(T^3).$$

From (56) and (57) with $\epsilon = \epsilon_\mu = 1/(2M)$ we obtain

$$|u|_{C^{1+\mu}} \leq 2(M + M'_{\epsilon_\mu}) |u|_{C^0} + 2M |\Delta u|_{C^0}, \quad \text{for all } u \in C^2(T^3).$$

Using (57) a second time with $\epsilon = \epsilon' > 0$, we get in the end

$$|u|_{C^1} \leq \left(M'_{\epsilon'} + 2\epsilon(M + M'_{\epsilon_\mu}) \right) |u|_{C^0} + 2M\epsilon' |\Delta u|_{C^0}, \quad \text{for all } u \in C^2(T^3). \quad \square$$

Theorem 14. *Given $F \in C^2(T^3)$ satisfying condition (7), there exists a positive constant C , depending only on $\|F\|_{C^2}$, such that*

$$|\Delta u|_{C^0} \leq C,$$

for all $u \in \tilde{C}^4(T^3)$ solution to equation (10).

Proof. From Theorems 9, 11 and 12 we obtain that there exists a positive constant C' such that for all $\epsilon > 0$ we have:

$$|\Delta u|_{C^0} \leq C' \left(1 + M_\epsilon + \epsilon |\Delta u|_{C^0} \right),$$

for all u satisfying the hypotheses of the theorem. $\square$

Corollary 15. *Given $F \in C^2(T^3)$ satisfying condition (7), there exists a positive constant C , depending only on $\|F\|_{C^2}$, such that*

$$|u|_{C^1} \leq C,$$

for all $u \in \tilde{C}^4(T^3)$ solution to equation (10).

Proof. It follows from Theorems 12 and 14. $\square$

Corollary 16. *Equation (10) is strictly uniformly elliptic, in the sense that there exists a positive constant C , depending only on $\|F\|_{C^2}$, such that for all $u \in \tilde{C}^4(T^3)$ solution to equation (10), we have*

$$\Lambda^{-1} \leq \lambda_- \leq \lambda_+ \leq \Lambda,$$

where $\lambda_\pm$ are defined in formula (36).

4.3. $C^{2+\rho}$ -estimate. We begin by recalling a theorem of [14], which greatly simplifies the estimate of second derivatives. In [14] the theorem has been stated locally, but on compact manifolds it holds globally.

Theorem 17 ([14, Theorem 5.1]). *Let $\tilde{\Omega}$ be the solution of the Calabi-Yau equation*

$$\tilde{\Omega}^n = e^F \Omega^n, \quad [\tilde{\Omega}] = [\Omega],$$

on a compact almost-Kähler manifold (M^{2n}, Ω, J) .

Assume there are two constants $C_0 > 0$ and $0 < \rho_0 < 1$ such that $F \in C^{\rho_0}(M^{2n})$ and

$$\text{tr } \tilde{g} \leq C_0,$$

where $\tilde{g}$ is the Riemannian metric associated to $\tilde{\Omega}$.

Then there exist two constants $C > 0$ and $0 < \rho < 1$, depending only on M^{2n} , Ω , J , C_0 and $\|F\|_{C^\rho}$, such that

$$\|\tilde{g}\|_{C^\rho} \leq C.$$

Using this Theorem we easily prove the following estimate.

Theorem 18. *Given $F \in C^2(T^3)$ satisfying condition (7), there exist constants $C > 0$ and $\rho > 0$, both depending only on $\|F\|_{C^2}$, such that*

$$(58) \quad \|u\|_{C^{2+\rho}} \leq C,$$

for all $u \in \tilde{C}^4(T^3)$ solution to equation (10).

Proof. From (20) we obtain that the Riemannian metric $\tilde{g}$ is represented by the matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 + u_{yy} + u_{tt} + u_t & u_{xy} & 0 & u_{xt} \\ u_{xy} & 1 + u_{xx} & u_{xt} & 0 \\ 0 & u_{xt} & 1 + u_{yy} + u_{tt} + u_t & -u_{xy} \\ u_{xt} & 0 & -u_{xt} & 1 + u_{xx} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then

$$\text{tr } \tilde{g} = 2(2 + \Delta u + u_t).$$

Thanks to Theorem 14 and Corollary 16 we can apply Theorem 17 and get that

$$(59) \quad \max\{\|1 + u_{xx}\|_{C^\rho}, \|1 + u_{yy} + u_{tt} + u_t\|_{C^\rho}, \|u_{xy}\|_{C^\rho}, \|u_{xt}\|_{C^\rho}\} \leq C,$$

where C depends only on $\|F\|_{C^2}$.

Now the estimates of the second derivatives can be obtained as follows. Given a solution u of equation (10), we have that u can be viewed as a solution of the equation

$$(60) \quad a_1 u_{xx} + a_2 (u_{yy} + u_{tt}) + 2a_3 u_{xy} + 2a_4 u_{xt} + b u_t = f,$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} a_1 &= (1 + u_{yy} + u_{tt} + u_t), & a_2 &= (1 + u_{xx}), & a_3 &= -u_{xy}, & a_4 &= -u_{xt}, \\ b &= 1 + u_{xx}, & f &= 2e^F - (2 + \Delta u + u_t). \end{aligned}$$

Equation (60) is uniformly elliptic, with coefficients in $C^\rho(T^3)$. Thanks to (59) and Theorem 9, standard Schauder theory gives the estimate (58). $\square$

5. PROOF OF THEOREM 1

Proposition 19. *Assume $u \in \tilde{C}^{2+\rho}(T^3)$ is a solution to equation (10) with $\rho > 0$. If $F \in C^\infty(T^3)$ then $u \in \tilde{C}^\infty(T^3)$.*

Proof. By Proposition 10 the equation (10) is elliptic. Then from [10, Theorem 4.8, Chapter 14], it follows that u belongs to the Sobolev space $W^{n,2}(T^3)$, for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. But this implies that $u \in C^\infty(T^3)$. $\square$

Thanks to Proposition 3, Theorem 1 is an immediate consequence of the following

Theorem 20. *Let $F \in C^\infty(T^3)$ satisfy (7). Then equation (10) has a solution $u \in \tilde{C}^\infty(T^3)$.*

Proof. We apply the continuity method (see [7, Section 17.2]). For $0 \leq \theta \leq 1$, let

$$(61) \quad \mathfrak{S}_\theta = \left\{ u \in \tilde{C}^\infty(T^3) : (1 + u_{yy} + u_{tt} + u_t)(1 + u_{xx}) - u_{xy}^2 - u_{xt}^2 = e^{F_\theta} \right\}$$

where

$$F_\theta = \log(1 - \theta + \theta e^F).$$

Note that $0 \in \mathfrak{S}_0$ and that $\mathfrak{S}_1$ consists in the solutions to (10) lying in $\tilde{C}^\infty(T^3)$. Since

$$\max_{0 \leq \theta \leq 1} \|F_\theta\|_{C^2} < \infty,$$

and

$$\int_{T^3} e^{F_\theta} dV = \int_{T^3} (1 - \theta + \theta e^F) dV = 1,$$

by Theorem 18 there exists a real number $\rho > 0$ such that

$$(62) \quad \sup_{u \in \mathfrak{S}} \|u\|_{C^{2+\rho}} < \infty,$$

with

$$\mathfrak{S} = \bigcup_{0 \leq \theta \leq 1} \mathfrak{S}_\theta \neq \emptyset.$$

Since $0 \in \mathfrak{S}_0$, the set $\{\theta \in [0, 1] : \mathfrak{S}_\theta \neq \emptyset\}$ is not empty and we can define

$$\mu = \sup\{\theta \in [0, 1] : \mathfrak{S}_\theta \neq \emptyset\}.$$

In order to complete the proof we have to show that $\mathfrak{S}_\mu \neq \emptyset$ and $\mu = 1$.

- $\mathfrak{S}_\mu \neq \emptyset$. By the definition of μ there exist two sequences $(\theta_k) \subset [0, 1]$ and $(u_k) \subset \tilde{C}^\infty(T^3)$ such that (μ_k) is increasing and $u_k \in \mathfrak{S}_{\theta_k}$ for all k . Thanks to (62), the sequence (u_k) is bounded in $\tilde{C}^\rho(T^3)$, then by Ascoli-Arzelà Theorem there exists a subsequence (u_{k_j}) convergent in $\tilde{C}^{2+\rho/2}(T^3)$. Let $v = \lim u_{k_j}$. Then v belongs to $\tilde{C}^{2+\rho/2}(T^3)$ and satisfies the equation

$$(1 + v_{yy} + v_{tt} + v_t)(1 + v_{xx}) - v_{xy}^2 - v_{xt}^2 = e^{F_\mu}.$$

By Proposition 10 the equation (10) is elliptic and the standard theory of elliptic equations implies that v belongs to $\tilde{C}^\infty(T^3)$ (see e.g. [10, Chapter 14]). In particular, v belongs to $\mathfrak{S}_\mu$, which turns out to be not empty.

- $\mu = 1$. Assume by contradiction $\mu < 1$ and define the non-linear C^∞ operator

$$\begin{cases} T : \tilde{C}^\rho(T^3) \times [0, 1] \rightarrow C^{\rho-2}(T^3), \\ T(u, \theta) = (1 + u_{yy} + u_{tt} + u_t)(1 + u_{xx}) - u_{xy}^2 - u_{xt}^2 - e^{F_\theta}. \end{cases}$$

Since $\mathfrak{S}_\mu$ is not empty, there exists $v \in \mathfrak{S}_\mu$ such that $T(v, \mu) = 0$. Compute

$$\partial_1 T(v, \mu)w = Lw,$$

where

$$Lw = (1 + v_{yy} + v_{tt} + v_t)w_{xx} + (1 + v_{xx})(w_{yy} + w_{tt} + w_t) - 2v_{xy}w_{xy} - 2v_{xt}w_{xt}.$$

Proposition 10 implies that $L : \tilde{C}^{2+\rho}(T^3) \rightarrow \tilde{C}^\rho(T^3)$ is elliptic. Then by Strong Maximum Principle $L = 0$ implies that u is constant. This shows that L is one-to-one on $\tilde{C}^{2+\rho}$. Moreover, by ellipticity, L has closed range, thus Schauder Theory and Continuity Method (see [7, Theorem 5.2]) show that L is onto. Therefore by Implicit Function Theorem there exists an $\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$T(u, \theta) = 0$$

is solvable with respect to u for every $\theta \in (\mu - \epsilon, \mu + \epsilon)$. Thanks to Proposition 19, these solutions belong to $\tilde{C}^\infty(T^3)$. Then $\mathfrak{S}_\theta \neq \emptyset$ for all $\mu < \theta < \mu + \epsilon$, in contradiction with the definition of μ . $\square$

6. PROOF OF THEOREM 2

Consider on M an almost-Kähler structure (Ω, J) such that e^4 is orthogonal to e^1, e^2, e^3 with respect to the Riemannian metric induced by (Ω, J) . Then we can find an invariant orthonormal co-frame $\{f^1, f^2, f^3, f^4\}$ such that

$$(63) \quad \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}}\{f^1, f^2, f^3\} = \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}}\{e^1, e^2, e^3\}, \quad \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}}\{f^4\} = \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}}\{e^4\},$$

and

$$(64) \quad \Omega = f^{13} - f^{24}.$$

Let u be an S^1 -invariant function on M , that is not depending on z , and set

$$u_i = f_i u,$$

where $\{f_1, f_2, f_3, f_4\}$ is the frame dual to $\{f^1, f^2, f^3, f^4\}$. Observe that

$$u_4 = 0,$$

because $\text{span}_{\mathbb{R}}\{f_4\} = \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}}\{e_4\}$. From (63) we know that there exists a non-singular matrix A such that

$$e^i = \sum_{j=1}^3 A_j^i f^j, \quad \text{for } i \in \{1, 2, 3\}, \quad e^4 = A_4^4 f^4.$$

Then we have

$$df^4 = \frac{1}{A_4^4} de^4 = \frac{1}{A_4^4} e^{12} = \frac{1}{A_4^4} \sum_{j,k=1}^3 A_j^1 A_k^2 f^{jk} = \lambda^1 f^{23} + \lambda^2 f^{13} + \lambda^3 f^{12},$$

with

$$\lambda^1 = \frac{A_2^1 A_3^2 - A_3^1 A_2^2}{A_4^4}, \quad \lambda^2 = \frac{A_1^1 A_3^2 - A_3^1 A_1^2}{A_4^4}, \quad \lambda^3 = \frac{A_1^1 A_2^2 - A_2^1 A_1^2}{A_4^4}.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} dd^c u &= - \sum_{i,j=1}^3 u_{ij} f^i \wedge J f^j + u_2 (\lambda^1 f^{23} + \lambda^2 f^{13} + \lambda^3 f^{12}) \\ &= - \sum_{i,j=1}^3 u_{ij} f^i \wedge J f^j + d(u(\lambda^1 f^3 - \lambda^3 f^1)) - \left(\sum_{i=1}^3 \lambda^i u_i \right) f^{13} \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, if we set

$$(65) \quad \alpha = d^c v - u(\lambda^1 f^3 - \lambda^3 f^1),$$

we have that $d\alpha$ is of type $(1, 1)$ and

$$d\alpha = - \sum_{i,j=1}^3 u_{ij} f^i \wedge Jf^j + \left(\sum_{i=1}^3 \lambda^i u_i \right) f^{13}.$$

At this point, a simple computation shows that α satisfies (4) if and only if u satisfies the following PDE

$$(66) \quad (1 + u_{22}) \left(1 + u_{11} + u_{33} + \sum_{i=1}^3 \lambda^i u_i \right) - (u_{12})^2 - (u_{13})^2 = e^F.$$

In conclusion we have proven the following

Proposition 21. *Consider on M an almost-Kähler structure (Ω, J) such that e^4 is orthogonal to e^1, e^2, e^3 with respect to the Riemannian metric induced by (Ω, J) . Let $F : T^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a smooth function satisfying (7). Let $\{f^1, f^2, f^3, f^4\}$ be an invariant orthonormal co-frame for which (63) and (64) are satisfied. Let $u : T^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a smooth function satisfying (8). Then the 1-form (65) solves (3) if and only if u is a solution to the non-linear PDE (66).*

Equation (66) is very similar to equation (12). As a matter of facts the only really new feature is that the unknown u is periodic with respect to the lattice generated by $\{e_1, e_2, e_3\}$ and *not* with respect to the one generated by the new frame $\{f_1, f_2, f_3\}$. Then the proof of Proposition 5 fails unless u is periodic in the direction of f_2 . However from assumption (6) it follows that there exist 4 integers n, j, k, m , with $n > 0$, such that

$$(67) \quad nf_2 = je_1 + ke_2 + me_3.$$

Now we can estimate u_2 .

Proposition 22. *Let $\pi : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow T^3$ be the quotient map. Assume (67) is satisfied. Then the map*

$$\begin{cases} T : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow T^3, \\ T(s) = \pi\left(\frac{j}{n}s, \frac{k}{n}s, \frac{m}{n}s\right), \end{cases}$$

is periodic. Let ν be the minimum positive period of T . Then

$$|u_2| \leq \nu,$$

for all solution u to equation (66).

Proof. Fix $(x, y, t) \in \mathbb{R}^3$, and consider the periodic function

$$v(s) = u(x + js/n, y + ks/n, t + ms/n).$$

We have

$$v''(s) = u_{22}u(x + js/n, y + ks/n, t + ms/n) \geq -1.$$

Let $s_0 \in [0, \nu]$ be a critical point of v . Then we have

$$v'(s) = \int_{s_0}^s v''(r) dr \begin{cases} \geq -(s - s_0) \geq -\nu, & s_0 \leq s \leq s_0 + \nu, \\ \leq -(s - s_0) \geq -\nu, & s_0 - \nu \leq s \leq s_0. \end{cases}$$

By periodicity we get that these estimates hold everywhere, in particular we get

$$|u_2(x, y, t)| = |v'(0)| \leq \nu. \quad \square$$

The rest of the proof of Theorem 2 can be obtained by a slight modification of the argument used to prove Theorem (1) and it is left to the reader.

REFERENCES

- [1] E. Abbena, An example of an almost Kähler manifold which is not Kählerian, *Boll. Un. Mat. Ital. A (6)* **3** (1984), no. 3, 383–392.
- [2] R.A. Adams, *Sobolev Spaces*, Pure and Applied Mathematics, vol. **65**, Academic Press, Orlando, 1975.
- [3] E. Buzano, A. Fino and L. Vezzoni, The Calabi-Yau equation for T^2 -bundles over the non-Lagrangian case, *Rend. Semin. Mat. Univ. Politec. Torino* **69** (2011), no. 3, 281–298.
- [4] E. Calabi, On Kähler manifolds with vanishing canonical class, in *Algebraic geometry and topology. A symposium in honor of S. Lefschetz*, pp. 78–89. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1957.
- [5] S.K. Donaldson, Two-forms on four-manifolds and elliptic equations. *Inspired by S.S. Chern*, 153–172, Nankai Tracts Math. **11**, World Scientific, Hackensack N.J., 2006.
- [6] A. Fino, Y.Y. Li, S. Salamon and L. Vezzoni, The Calabi-Yau equation on 4-manifolds over 2-tori, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **365** (2013), no. 3, 1551–1575.
- [7] D. Gilbarg and N.S. Trudinger, *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*, second ed., Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences], vol. **224**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1983.
- [8] D.D. Joyce, *Compact manifolds with special holonomy*, Oxford Mathematical Monographs. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2000. xii+436 pp.
- [9] C.H. Taubes, Tamed to compatible: symplectic forms via moduli space integration. *J. Symplectic Geom.* **9** (2011), no. 2, 161–250.
- [10] M.E. Taylor, *Partial Differential Equations III, Nonlinear Equations*, Applied Mathematical Sciences, vol. V **117**, Springer, New York, NY, 1996.
- [11] W.P. Thurston, Some simple examples of symplectic manifolds, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **55** (1976), 467–468.
- [12] V. Tosatti and B. Weinkove, The Calabi-Yau equation on the Kodaira-Thurston manifold, *J. Inst. Math. Jussieu* **10** (2011), no. 2, 437–447.
- [13] V. Tosatti, B. Weinkove and S.T. Yau, Taming symplectic forms and the Calabi-Yau equation, *Proc. London Math. Soc.* **97** (2008), no. 2, 401–424.
- [14] V. Tosatti, Y. Wang, B. Weinkove and X. Yang, $C^{2,\alpha}$ estimates for nonlinear elliptic equations in complex and almost complex geometry. [arXiv:1402.0554](https://arxiv.org/abs/1402.0554).
- [15] S.T. Yau, On the Ricci curvature of a compact Kähler manifold and the complex Monge-Ampère equation, I, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **31** (1978), no. 3, 339–411.
- [16] B. Weinkove, The Calabi-Yau equation on almost-Kähler four-manifolds, *J. Differential Geom.* **76** (2007), no. 2, 317–349.

Ernesto Buzano, Anna Fino and Luigi Vezzoni,
 Dipartimento di Matematica, Università di Torino, Via Carlo Alberto 10, 10123 Torino, Italy.
 E-mail: ernesto.buzano@unito.it, annamaria.fino@unito.it, luigi.vezzoni@unito.it